

Committee on Accreditation
Subcommittee on the Accreditation Review Process
Informal Notes
February 26, 2004

COA Members Present

David Madrigal
Ed Kujawa
Lynne Cook
Sue Teele
Dana Griggs

Staff Members Present

Beth Graybill
Larry Birch
Cheryl Hickey
Helen Hawley
Teri Ackerman

Others Present

Bonnie Crawford, California Credential Counselors and Analysts of California
Veronica Villalobos, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Beverly Young, California State University Chancellor's Office
Bob Polkinghorn, University of California Office of the President
Cathy Buell, San Jose State University, BIR member
Steve Betando, Association of California School Administrators
Joyce Abrams, California Teachers Association

Call to Order

The meeting of the Subcommittee on the Accreditation Review Process was called to order by David Madrigal at 10:10 a.m. on Thursday, February 26, 2004. Introductions were made.

Those present reviewed the Committee on Accreditation meeting notes of January 22, 2004.

Meeting Goals

It was agreed upon by those present that the goals of this meeting should include:

- The analysis and discussion of options for conducting the accreditation review and selection of a preferred option to be brought to the COA at their March 2004 meeting.
- Discussion and analysis of previously identified issues and possible workgroup organization schemes.
- Discussion and identification of preliminary goals for California's accreditation system for educator preparation.

Goals for the Review Process

To begin, the group discussed a handout that contained draft goals for the review process. (Note: The title of this discussion document was changed to “Guiding Principles for the Accreditation Review” to more accurately reflect its contents.) The list reflect a synthesis of comments related to process shared by stakeholders at the January 22, 2004 meeting of the COA. The group discussed the document as presented and offered suggestions for improvement. A copy of the handout as presented is included as an attachment to these notes. A revised list will be prepared by staff to reflect the comments of the subcommittee members and stakeholders and will be shared at the Committee on Accreditation meeting in March.

Options for Conducting Review

The group discussed four possible options for conducting the review, outlined in Handout #3. A copy of this handout is included as an attachment to these notes. Staff noted that it would attempt to synthesize the advantages and disadvantages of each option raised by the group to be reflected in a new document that will be brought before the COA at its meeting in March.

Option 1, which is the proposal submitted by the higher education community was the focus of the discussion for most of the morning.

Option 1 as originally presented is as follows: with COA in leadership role, form working group of individuals to develop redesign plan over the next six to nine months. The workgroup would consist of 12-15 members and include: 1) 2 representatives from each of the higher education segments; 2) 2 representatives from K-12 school districts or COEs that have CCTC-approved teacher education programs; 3) 2 representatives from the K-12 education community, including teachers and administrators; 4) a subset of the COA; and 5) 2 members of the CCTC staff.

The advantages of Option 1 were discussed, focusing on the fact that it creates a work group that takes responsibility “in the whole.” That is, it allows the stakeholders the opportunity to address not just individual issues, but the potential changes to the system “in the whole”. The working group would take on a variety of issues, work with the CCTC staff and bring information back to the COA. The work group would also retain the option to establish smaller working groups around other issues, but it would be the main “working body”.

Several noted that because many of the issues related to accreditation overlap, to separate them with disparate work groups may slow down the process. However, the stakeholders also stressed that there should be an option to retain expert groups on an as-needed or ad hoc basis as issues arise that need further attention.

It was suggested that consideration be given with respect to including more representatives from K-12 education community, since elementary, middle school and high school teachers each view things differently.

The optimal size of the working group was also discussed. There was general consensus that the working group ought not be too large to adversely affect the cohesiveness of the group.

The group discussed whether it would be advisable to hold joint meetings with COA. In general, most were in agreement with holding some joint meetings with COA, however, the stakeholders argued that in order to do the work effectively, and to keep intact the integrity of the working group, that not all meetings should be held jointly. The group agreed that 3-4 joint meetings would probably be an effective, efficient, and balanced way of handling the need for good communication between COA and the working group and attending to the research and work necessary for the review. Several noted that these joint meetings would not be a “work” day for the working group, but would rather be for the purposes of sharing information, providing feedback, and discussing issues and process.

The group discussed whether the working group ought to include representatives from the entire learning to teach continuum. The possible benefits of including someone to represent subject matter programs from one end of the learning to teach continuum and the possible benefits of including someone from the induction community at the other end of the continuum was discussed. Also discussed was whether other individuals already determined to be on the working group could represent these two aspects, particularly subject matter, without needing to add other representatives specifically. There appeared to be general agreement that having representation from the entire learning to teach continuum would be beneficial to the process.

The group reviewed Option 2 which would, with COA in a leadership role, establish issue-oriented workgroups comprised of COA membership and stakeholders. COA and workgroups would meet jointly for 8 meetings. The group had already discussed the need for the working group to meet separately from the COA and hence, this option did not garner support. In addition, it was pointed out that 8 full meetings of COA would require significant resources. This option was dismissed quickly.

Those present discussed Option 3 which would establish issue oriented workgroups. Meetings would be held both jointly with COA by embedding them within some COA meetings while some would be held separately. Stakeholders shared that they believed this option breaches the notion of collegiality and cooperation and that one cohesive working group is needed.

It was recognized that one fundamental difference between Option 1 and Option 3 is that under Option 1, a working group would have responsibility for ultimately bringing everything together. Under Option 3, that responsibility falls to the COA. It was also argued that smaller workgroups do not represent ongoing stakeholder commitment unless members represented the same interests in each workgroup.

Questions were raised and discussed such as whether the composition of each workgroup would be the same, whether the structure of each workgroup be the same, and who establishes the issues for the workgroup to study.

It was agreed that regardless of option, any model will fall apart without cooperation between all parties throughout. It was recognized that extensive communication between COA and any working group would be required regardless of the option chosen.

Discussion ensued about the manner in which membership on the issue-oriented workgroups would be determined. CCTC staff suggested that it could either be the same individuals who have been previously identified under Option 1, or may include others, chosen by stakeholders, that may have particular topical areas of expertise, such as candidate competence or quantitative data collection and analysis. It was questioned whether there would be a pool of people (to choose from) identified ahead of time. It was agreed that under this option stakeholder groups would have a say in who would serve on these issue-oriented workgroups.

Stakeholders noted that the costs involved in supporting numerous issue-oriented workgroups would likely be considerable and that they would not be prepared to support this effort at the level that would be required.

Stakeholders reiterated their belief that this option was a fundamental breach of the Commission directive for inclusion.

The group decided not to discuss Option 4 in any detail because it was essentially the same as Option 3 with the exception of resources to support formal COA participation on the workgroups. In Option 4, COA members would support the cost of their participation at some workgroup meetings.

The group decided to create a new Option 5 to reflect the preferred option.

Through discussion, it was agreed that three options would be put forth to the COA, with one option preferred by the group. In considering the Option structures, it was agreed that Option 1 would be referred to as “A”, Option 3 would be referred to as “B” and Option 5 would be referred to as “C”.

It was agreed that, in presenting the options to the COA, A, B, and C should be presented, along with the pros and cons of each option. Option C would represent the preferred option. It would encompass many of the concepts included in the original higher education community proposal, many aspects of its structure, but it would be augmented as a result of discussion at this meeting. It would include adding representation from subject matter preparation as well as from the induction community. It would also include the concept of 3-4 joint meetings, however, the working group must also have opportunity to meet together as whole outside of COA meetings.

The group deferred further discussion of the exact number and composition of the working group until the meeting of the COA on March 18th. However, it was agreed that there be no more than 20 people serving on the working group. Including those members identified previously, it was agreed that there should be equitable, not necessarily equal, representation between the higher education and K-12. It was suggested that the group include 4 representatives from COA but left resolution of this to the March 18 meeting.

The group discussed whether the issue of the two groups (COA and the working group) working together and communicating effectively might be mitigated by having the working group co-facilitated by one COA representative and one representative from the stakeholder groups. All were generally supportive of this notion.

The notion of whether having COA members on the working group raises any voting issues for the COA members was discussed. Staff said that it will investigate whether there would be any issues involved that would limit or prohibit COA members from participating in working group meetings and eventually voting on issues or proposals. One manner in which this could be addressed is by having the working group operate in a consensus mode. The main charge of the working group would be to serve as a fact finding and recommending body.

On March 18, the following will be presented to the COA: Options A and B (formerly Options 1 and 3) as originally presented and Option C, which is the preferred option. The COA will have the opportunity to discuss the preferred option further.

It was agreed that the remainder of the agenda items for today would be discussed at the March 18 meeting of COA.

The meeting was adjourned by Ed Kujawa at 3:40 p.m

ATTACHMENT

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Goals for the Review Process Synthesized from the Small Group discussion COA meeting with Stakeholders 1/22/04

1. Ensure adequate cross section of stakeholders including representation from teachers. Consider the appropriate role that induction should play in the review as well as others involved in the learning-to-teach continuum.
2. Establish a variety of public input options. These might include establishment of workgroups, use of focus groups, public hearings, surveys including web-based options, field reviews, and others strategies to maximize stakeholder input throughout the process.
3. Develop a subcommittee/workgroup structure. Workgroups should have a clear charge.
4. Build into the process appropriate "sunshine" strategies and time.
5. Establish a planned schedule for review.
6. Establish group norms that guide group activities regarding various aspects of the review. For example, reporting to and from constituency groups, development of options or recommendations for consideration, role and involvement of the CTC staff and COA membership.
7. Establish a process that is iterative, that is, there is frequent communication among workgroups, the COA, and the Commission.

ATTACHMENT
FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
WORKSHEET OF OPTIONS FOR CONDUCTING REVIEW

OPTIONS	STRUCTURE	CHARGE	FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS	GROUP COMMENTS
Option 1. COA in leadership role, form working group of 12-15 individuals to develop redesign plan over the next six to nine months.	Working group consists of: 1) 2 reps from higher ed chosen by segments; 2) 2 reps from K-12 school districts or COEs that have CCTC-approved teacher ed programs; 3) 2 reps K-12 ed community, including teachers and administrators; 4) the COA; 5) 2 CCTC staff.	Review existing framework, AIR evaluation, contextual factors, and recommend to the Commission within two months the: a) goals of the redesign process; b) workplan for completing the design within six to nine months; c) process for involving all stakeholders in the redesign.	Each segment represented on working group commits supporting costs of their segmental participation in redesign process.	
Option 2. COA in leadership role. Establish issue-oriented workgroups comprised of COA membership and stakeholders. COA and workgroups meet jointly, 8 meetings	COA would meet 8 times (every 4-6 weeks) in conjunction with issue-oriented workgroups. Workgroup meetings would be embedded in COA meetings. COA and workgroups would begin as large group, break out into issue-oriented workgroups, and reconvene as whole group at the end of day. Structure would help ensure workgroup efforts were well coordinated and consistent with the priorities of COA and stakeholder groups.	To be discussed. COA in steering role. Charge to workgroups would depend on topic.	Commission resources to support 8 COA meetings required. Segmental representatives would support the cost of their participation.	

OPTIONS	STRUCTURE	CHARGE	FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS	GROUP COMMENTS
<p>Option 3. COA in leadership role. Establish issue-oriented workgroups comprised of COA membership and stakeholders.</p> <p>Combination of joint COA/workgroup meetings (4) and some workgroup apart from COA meetings. COA membership involvement in all workgroup meetings</p>	<p>Four COA meetings with embedded workgroup meetings would be supplemented by additional workgroup meetings (held separate from COA meetings) Structure for embedded meetings would be the same as in Option 2. One to two COA members would participate in workgroup meetings.</p> <p>Ensures some level of coordination between workgroups and COA.</p>	<p>To be discussed. COA in steering role. Charge to workgroups would depend on topic.</p>	<p>Commission resources to support 4 COA meetings required. Segmental representatives would support cost of their participation. Commission to cover the cost of 1-2 COA members on each workgroup for the 4 separate workgroup meetings.</p>	
<p>Option 4. COA in leadership role. Establish issue-oriented workgroups comprised of COA membership and stakeholders.</p> <p>Combination of joint COA/workgroup meetings (4) and workgroup meetings apart from COA meetings. COA membership on workgroups optional.</p>	<p>Same structure as option 3 with the exception that COA participation on workgroup meetings outside of COA meetings would be optional.</p> <p>Coordination among workgroups and COA would be more challenging under this option.</p>	<p>To be discussed. COA in steering role. Charge to workgroups would depend on topic.</p>	<p>Commission resources to support 4 COA meetings required. Segmental representatives would support cost of their participation. Participation by COA membership at workgroup meetings would not be covered by the Commission.</p>	
<p>Option 5. Group Generated Options</p>				